



**State of Connecticut**  
**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
STATE CAPITOL  
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

**REPRESENTATIVE DIANA S. URBAN**  
FORTY THIRD ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING  
ROOM 4042  
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591  
HOME: (860) 535-4868  
CAPITOL: 860-240-8710  
TOLL FREE: 1-800-842-8267  
FAX: (860) 240-0206  
E-MAIL: [Diana.Urban@cga.ct.gov](mailto:Diana.Urban@cga.ct.gov)

**CHAIR**  
COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN  
RBA SUBCOMMITTEE

**MEMBER**  
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
PROGRAM REVIEW & INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE

March 20, 2013

Good Morning Senator Gerratana, Representative Johnson, Senator Welch, Representative Srinivasan and distinguished members of the Public Health Committee. For the record, I am Diana Urban, representing the 43<sup>rd</sup> district. I am here to testify on HB 6591 AN ACT REQUIRING THE EUTHANIZATION OF ANY CAT OR DOG TO BE PREFORMED BY A LICENSED VETERINARIAN.

This bill arises from a situation that Representative Camillo, co-chair of Legislators for Animal Advocacy, followed closely and brought to the attention of other legislators in the caucus. This bill, known as "Buddy's Law", is named after a beautiful 5-year-old German shepherd who had been given up by his owner devastated by his inability to properly care for his beloved dog. Buddy was then shuffled to rescue organizations before finding what appeared to be the perfect adopter; a young woman who wanted Buddy as her only pet. Within 48 hours Buddy was dead, and that is where the story becomes complicated. It is unclear who shot Buddy but it is believed he was shot in the head by the woman's boyfriend because the dog allegedly bit her. There are no records of the woman visiting the hospital even though the couple claims there are pictures of the bite marks which have not surfaced. Buddy did not have a bite history. Although the woman's boyfriend allegedly shot Buddy, at one point this man accused his girlfriend of the shooting. The couple was not arrested or charged with this crime. The "facts" of this story have exposed flaws in current Connecticut guidelines and laws for euthanizing dogs.

Rep. Camillo immediately responded and tried to get to the bottom of the whole sorry story. I will leave it to him to give you the details. However, he also introduced this legislation so that no other dog or cat could be wantonly killed without the protection of legislation. This bill includes a penalty for breaking that law. He has been working on this diligently and it is our hope that this session will be the charm.

In addition, there was some meddling with the language that, in essence, changed the whole thrust of the bill. When made aware of it, the Chairs of this committee were happy to get the language straightened out and I have attached the "new" proposed language. This language has regained focus to only allow a licensed veterinarian euthanize domestic animals, in efforts to prevent another case like Buddy's. If you recall, this language is very similar to an amendment to SB 246 (LCO No. 5325) in session last year regarding this same initiative. This was language already discussed and agreed upon but unfortunately with a shorter session time ran out.

I urge the members of this committee to favorably report this bill in memory of Buddy and put into place statutory safeguards for the euthanization of our beloved household pets.

Sincerely,  
Diana Urban  
Co-Chair, Children's Committee

## **Language for HB 6591**

"Sec. 1. (NEW) (Effective from passage) (a) Notwithstanding any provision of the general statutes, whenever any cat or dog is euthanized, such euthanization shall be performed in a humane manner by a licensed veterinarian, provided nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the euthanization of any cat or dog while such cat or dog is attacking a person or another animal under circumstances where a reasonable person would consider such attack life-threatening to a person or another animal or likely to cause serious physical injury to a person or another animal. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to apply to the euthanization of any farm animal or livestock or to the euthanization of any cat or dog by any law enforcement officer in the course of his or her duties.

(b) Any person who violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than one thousand dollars or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

(c) It shall be a defense to prosecution under this section that such person euthanized such cat or dog with a life-threatening injury in order to prevent such cat or dog's further suffering